1920

SOME

REMARKS

ON

Mr. *HILL*'s

FARRAGO DOUBLE-DISTILLED.

BY JOHN WESLEY.

If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men. ROM. xii. 18.

BRISTOL:

PRINTED BY WILLIAM [illegible]

M.DCC.[illegible]

FEB

SOME REMARKS ON Mr. *HILL*'s FARRAGO DOUBLE-DISTILLED.

1. IT is far from my design to give a particular answer to every thing contained in Mr. Hill's late treatise. I intend only to offer to the impartial reader, a few cursory remarks, which may partly explain and partly confirm what I have already said upon the subject.

2. "Poor Mr. Wesley*," says Mr. Hill, opening his cause with native eloquence, "has publish-"ed various tracts, out of which Mr. Hill collects "above an hundred gross contradictions. At this "Mr. W.'s temper is much ruffled;" (I believe not; I am not sensible of it;) "he primes, cocks,

* Page 3. Quotations from Mr. Hill are marked with double, from the Remarks, with single comma's.

" and fires at Calviniſm: and there is ſmoke and " fire in plenty. But if you can bear the ſtench, " (which indeed is very nauſeous) there is no danger " of being wounded ‡. He calls this laſt cannon, " or pop-gun, *Remarks on my review*. Men of ſenſe " ſay, it is quite unfit for duty: men of grace com- " paſſionate the *caſter* of it: men of pleaſantry " laugh heartily at it; but ſome good old women " ſpeak highly of it †." I give this paſſage at ſome length, as a genuine ſpecimen of Mr. Hill's manner of writing.

3. But " as Mr. Hill did not chuſe to prefix " his name, it *argued no great proof of* Mr. W.'s " *politeneſs*, to addreſs him in the perſonal manner " he has done." Which of us began? Was it not Mr. Hill? Did not he addreſs me in a perſonal manner firſt? And ſome, beſide the old women, are of opinion, he did not do it in the *politeſt* manner in the world.

4. " Mr. W. would have us know, that his " piece is written in much *love*. But what *love?* " Love to his own inconſiſtencies; love of ſcold- " ing, love of abuſe. Let the reader find out any " other ſort of love through the whole perform- " ance." In order to judge whether I wrote in love or no, let any one read the words he has picked out of fifty-four pages, juſt as they ſtand connected with others in each page: it will then appear they are not contrary either to love or meekneſs.

5. But Mr. W. ſays, Mr. Hill " is unworthy " the name either of the gentleman or the Chriſ- " tian: and is amazed, that Mr. Hill ſhould lay " claim to either of thoſe titles *." Not ſo. It is my belief, that Mr. Hill is both a gentleman and a Chriſtian: though I ſtill think, in his treatment of Mr. Fletcher and me, he has acted beneath his character.

‡ Page 4. † Page 5. * Page 6.

character. Yet it is very likely, "a friend of "yours § (not mine) might ſay, I wrote in *much* "*wrath.*" I wrote then in juſt as much wrath as I do now; though *your* friend might think otherwiſe.

6. Nay, but Mr. W. "gives ‖ all the Calviniſt "Miniſters the moſt ſcurrilous, Billinſgate lan-"guage, while he is trumpeting forth his own "praiſes, in Mr. F.'s Second Check to Antinomi-"aniſm." A ſmall miſtake. I do not give Billinſgate language to any one: I have not ſo learned Chriſt. Every one of thoſe hymns, out of which Mr. Hill culls the harſheſt expreſſions, are not mine, but my brother's. Neither do I "trumpet "forth my own praiſes." Mr. Hill's imagining I do, ariſes from an innocent miſtake. He continually takes for granted, that I read over and correct all Mr. F.'s books before they go to the preſs. So far from it, that the Fourth Check to Antinomianiſm I have not read over to this day. But Mr. W. "thinks himſelf to be *the greateſt miniſter in the* "*world.*" Exceedingly far from it. I know many now in England, at whoſe feet I deſire to be found in the day of the Lord Jeſus.

7. To that queſtion, Why does a man 'fall 'upon me, becauſe another gave him a good beat-'ing?' Mr. Hill anſwers, "If your trumpet had "not given the alarm, we ſhould not have pre-"pared ourſelves for the battle."* Nay truly, not mine, but Mr. Shirley's. I was ſitting quietly in my ſtudy, on the other ſide of St. George's channel, when *his* trumpet gave the alarm. Yet I ſay again, I am not *now* ſorry for theſe diſputes, though I *was* ſorry. You ſay, truly, "Mr. W.'s temper "has been manifeſted" hereby. ‡ Let all candid men judge between us. Whether Mr. F. and I on the one hand, or Mr. Hill on the other, has ſhewn

§ Page 7. ‖ Page 8. * Page 53. ‡ Page 56.

more " meekneſs and lowlineſs?" And which of us has expreſſed the greateſt heat, and the moſt cordial contempt of his opponent.

Mr. H. adds, " Hereby Mr. Charles Weſley's " Calviniſm is expoſed by Mr. John." Then that is expoſed, which never exiſted, for he never was a Calviniſt yet. And " hereby Mr. H. ſays, the " Chriſtian Library is given up as nothing." Mere fineſſe! Every one ſees my meaning, but thoſe that *will not* ſee it. It is *nothing to your purpoſe*: it *proves nothing of what it is brought to prove.* In the ſame ſenſe I ſet the word *nothing*, over againſt the citations from Mr. Baxter, and Goodwin.

8. If Mr. Hill ſays, he *always was* a Calviniſt, I have no right to contradict him. But I am ſure he was of a widely different temper, from that he has ſhewn in his late writings. I allow much to his belief, That in expoſing me to the utmoſt of his power, he is doing God ſervice. Yet I muſt needs ſay, if I were writing againſt a Turk, or a Pagan, I durſt not uſe him as Mr. Hill does me. And if I really am (which will one day appear) employing all my time, and labour, and talents, (ſuch as they are) for this ſingle end, That the kingdom of Chriſt may be ſet up on earth: Then he whom I ſerve in the goſpel of his Son will not commend him for his preſent work.

9. But what makes Mr. Hill ſo warm againſt me? I ſtill believe it is for this chiefly, becauſe I am an Arminian, an Election-doubter. For, ſays he, the " good old preacher, places all election-doubters, " (that is, thoſe who are not clear in the belief of " Abſolute Predeſtination) among the numerous " hoſts of the Diabolonians. One of theſe, being " brought before the Judge, the Judge tells him, he " muſt die."† That is plainly, he muſt die eternally for this damnable ſin. I beg Mr. Hill to explain himſelf

† Review, Page 35.

himſelf on this head. Does he ſtill ſubſcribe to the ſubſtance of this *good, old preacher?* Are all election-doubters to be placed among the Diabolonians? Is the ſentence irreverſibly paſſed, That they muſt all die eternally? I muſt inſiſt on Mr. Hill's anſwering this queſtion: If not, ſilence gives conſent.

10. Mr. H. farther affirms, "The only cement "of Chriſtian union is the love of God. And "the foundation of that love muſt be laid, in be- "lieving *the truths of God*:" (that is, you *muſt believe* particular redemption, or it is impoſſible you ſhould love God. For, to uſe "the words of Dr. "Owen in his diſplay of Arminianiſm," (ſee what *truths* Mr. Hill means!) "an agreement without "truth is no peace, but a covenant with death, "and a conſpiracy againſt the kingdom of Chriſt."‡ Here again I beg an explicit anſwer. Will Mr. H. affirm this in cool blood? If he will, there needs no more to account for his enmity both to me and the minutes. "Nay, but the foundation "is ſtruck at by thoſe wretched minutes."* True, the foundation of Calviniſm. So I obſerved before. I know it well. If the minutes ſtand, Calviniſm falls. But Mr. Hill ſays, "The doctrines of elec- "tion and perſeverance, are very little, indeed "ſcarcely at all *dwelled on* in the Review." Now I think they are much dwelt on therein, and deſire any that have eyes to judge.

11. We come now to the main queſtion, Is the *Farrago* true or falſe? I aver it to be totally falſe; except in one ſingle article, out of an hundred and one. I mean, Mr. Hill has not proved, that I contradict myſelf, except in that ſingle inſtance. To come to particulars.

I. "There

‡ Review, Page 93. * Page 52.

I.

" There was an *everlaſting covenant* between the " Father and Son, concerning man's redemption. " (There never was ſuch a covenant.")

The former propoſition is taken from the Chriſtian Library: On which Mr. Hill ſays again, " Mr. W. affirms, that the Chriſtian Library is " *all true, all agreeable to the word of God.*" I anſwered before, ' I do † not:' My words are *Pref.* p. 4, ' I have *endeavoured* to extract ſuch a collec- ' tion of Engliſh Divinity, as I *believe* is all true, all ' agreeable to the oracles of God.' I did *believe* and do believe every *tract* therein to be true and agreeable to the oracles of God. But I do not roundly affirm this ' of *every ſentence* contained in the ' fifty volumes. I could not poſſibly affirm it for ' two reaſons. 1. I was obliged to prepare moſt ' of thoſe tracts for the preſs, juſt as I could ſnatch ' time in travelling; not tranſcribing them; (none ' expected it of me) but only marking the lines ' with my pen, and altering a few words here and ' there, as I had mentioned in the preface. 2. As ' it was not in my power to attend the preſs, that ' care neceſſarily devolved on others; through ' whoſe inattention an hundred paſſages were left ' in, which I had ſcratched out. It is probable ' too, that I myſelf might overlook ſome ſentences ' which were not ſuitable to my own principles. ' It is certain, the correctors of the preſs did this ' in not a few inſtances. The plain inference is, ' if there are an hundred paſſages in the Chriſtian ' Library, which contradict any or all of my doc- ' trines, theſe are no proofs that I contradict my- ' ſelf. Be it obſerved once for all therefore, cita- ' tions from the Chriſtian Library prove nothing, ' but the careleſſneſs of the correctors.'

12. Yet

† Remarks, Page 12.

12. Yet Mr. Hill, as if he had never ſeen a word of this, or had ſolidly refuted it, gravely tells us again "If Mr. W. may * be credited, the "Farrago is all true: Part of it being taken out of "*his own* Chriſtian Library, in the preface of "which he tells us, That the contents are *all true*, "*all agreeable to the oracles of God.* Therefore *every* "*ſingle word* of it *is his own*, either by birth or adop-"tion." No: I never adopted, I could not adopt *every ſingle word* of the Chriſtian Library. It was impoſſible I ſhould have ſuch a thought, for the reaſons above mentioned.

But "there † is very great evaſion," ſays Mr. Hill, "in Mr. W.'s ſaying, That though he be-"lieves *every tract to be true*, yet he will not be "anſwerable for *every ſentence or expreſſion* in the "Chriſtian Library: whereas the matter by no "means reſts upon a few ſentences or expreſſions, "but upon *whole treatiſes*, which are diametrically "oppoſite to Mr. W.'s preſent tenets; particularly "the treatiſes of Dr. Sibs, Dr. Preſton, Biſhop Be-"veridge, and Dr. Owen, on Indwelling Sin."

13. Juſt before Mr. H. affirmed, "*Every ſingle* "*word* in the Chriſtian Library is *his own*." Beaten out of this hold, he retreats to another: but it is as untenable as the former. "The matter," he ſays, "does not reſt on a *few ſentences: whole treatiſes* are "diametrically oppoſite to his preſent tenets." He inſtances in the works of Dr. Sibs, Preſton, Beveridge, and a treatiſe of Dr. Owen's.

I join iſſue with him on this point. Here I pin him down. The works of Dr. Preſton, and Sibs, are in the ninth and tenth volumes of the Library: that treatiſe of Dr. Owen's in the ſeventeenth; that of Biſhop Beveridge in the forty-ſeventh. Take which of them you pleaſe: ſuppoſe the laſt, Biſhop Beveridge's *Thoughts upon Religion*. Is this *whole*

* Page 12. † Page 16.

whole treatiſe " diametrically oppoſite to my preſent " tenets?" The *Reſolutions* take up the greateſt part of the book; every ſentence of which exactly agrees with my preſent judgment; as do at leaſt nine parts in ten of the preceding *Thoughts*, on which thoſe *Reſolutions* are formed. Now what could poſſibly induce a perſon of Mr. Hill's character, a man of a good underſtanding and of a generous temper, a well-bred gentleman and a ſerious Chriſtian, to violate all the rules of juſtice and truth, which at other times he ſo earneſtly defends, by poſitively, deliberately, roundly aſſerting ſo intire a falſhood, merely to blacken one who loves his perſon, who eſteems his character, and is ready to ſerve him in any thing within his power? What, but ſo violent an attachment to his opinion, as while that is in danger ſuſpends all his faculties, ſo that he neither can *feel*, nor *think*, nor *ſpeak* like himſelf?

14. In the ninth and tenth volumes are two treatiſes of Dr. Preſton's, *The Breaſtplate of Faith and Love*, and *The New Covenant*. Is either of theſe " diametrically oppoſite to my preſent tenets?" By no means. If a *few ſentences* here and there, (and this I only ſuppoſe, not grant,) were careleſsly left in, though I had ſcratched them out, which ſeem (perhaps only *ſeem*) to contradict them; theſe are not *the whole tracts*; the general tenor of which I ſtill heartily ſubſcribe to.

The tenth volume likewiſe contains *Two Sermons* of Dr. Sibs, and his *Tract upon Solomon's Song*. Are any of theſe " diametrically oppoſite to my preſent " tenets?" No more than thoſe of Dr. Preſton's. I as willingly as ever ſubſcribe to theſe alſo.

Is Dr. Owen's tract, *Of the Remainder of Indwelling Sin in Believers*, " diametrically oppoſite to my " preſent tenets?" So far from it, that a few years ſince I publiſhed a ſermon on the very ſame ſubject.

ſubject. I hope there is no room to charge me with "quirk, quibble, artifice, evaſion," on this head: (though I believe as much as on any other.) I uſe only plain, manly reaſoning: and ſuch logic I am not aſhamed to avow before the whole learned world.

15. But "I will go farther ſtill *," (ſays Mr. Hill.) "Let Mr. W. only bring me twenty lines "together, out of the writings of thoſe four emi-"nent divines, as they ſtand in the Chriſtian Li-"brary; and I will engage to prove, that he has "twenty times contradicted them in ſome of his "other publications." Agreed. I bring him the following twenty lines, with which Dr. Preſton begins his treatiſe called *The New Covenant*. ‡

[Theſe words of God to Abraham contain a precept of ſincerity, or perfect walking with God, *Walk before me, and be thou perfect*; and alſo the motive thereunto, God's all-ſufficiency, *I am God all-ſufficient*. As if he ſhould ſay, If there were any defect in me, if thou didſt need or couldſt deſire any thing that were not to be had in me, and thou mighteſt have it elſewhere, perhaps thy heart might be imperfect in walking towards me. Thou mighteſt then ſtep out from me, to take in advantages elſewhere. But ſeeing I am all-ſufficient; ſince I have enough in me to fulfil all thy deſires; ſince I am every way an adequate object, ſo that all thy ſoul can wiſh for thou mayſt have in me; why then ſhouldſt thou not conſecrate thyſelf to me alone? Why then ſhouldſt thou be uneven in thy ways, ſerving me ſometimes, and ſometimes the creature? For there is nothing in the creature, but thou mayſt find in me. *I am all ſufficient: therefore walk before me, and be perfect!*]

Here are exactly twenty lines, neither more nor leſs, "as they ſtand in the Chriſtian Library." Now,

* Page 19. ‡ Vol. X. Page 47.

Now, fulfil your engagement: Prove that I "have "twenty times contradicted them in ſome other "of my publications." If you cannot, acknowledge you have done me wrong. In the heat of your reſentment, you have undertaken what you are not able to perform. You have ſpoken raſhly and unadviſedly. You have gone much too far, far beyond the bounds of wiſdom as well as of love.

16. Nay, but "I will go one ſtep farther yet. "I defy Mr. W. to bring me twenty lines out of "the above tracts, by Preſton, Sibs, Owen, and "Beveridge, which he now believes." Is it poſſible, that Mr. H. ſhould believe himſelf, while he is talking at this rate? Or does he expect that any one elſe ſhould believe him, unleſs he be drunk with paſſion or prejudice? Was ever any thing ſo wild? But I accept of this challenge, and that with more ſerioufneſs than it deſerves. I will go no farther than the twenty lines cited above: All theſe I "now believe." And I believe, as I ſaid before, not only the whole treatiſe from which thoſe words are taken, but the tenor of the whole Chriſtian Library.

Meantime it has been acknowledged again and again, that *ſeveral ſentences* ſtand therein, which I had put out in my uſual manner, by drawing my pen through them. Be it obſerved therefore once more, that thoſe paſſages prove nothing but the careleſſneſs of the correctors; conſequently, all the pains beſtowed to collect them together, whether by Mr. Hill or his coadjutors, is abſolutely loſt labour, and never can prove that I contradict myſelf.

17. The caſe is nearly the ſame with regard to thoſe other tracts which I publiſhed many years ago, Mr. *Baxter's Aphoriſms on Juſtification*, and *John Goodwin's Tract* on the ſubject. I have lately read them both over with all the attention I am

am capable of; and I ſtill believe they contain the true ſcripture-doctrine concerning juſtification by faith: but it does not follow, that I am accountable for every ſentence contained in either of thoſe treatiſes.

"But does Mr. W. believe the doctrine therein "contained, or does he not?" I do: and John Goodwin believed the doctrine contained in the ſermon on *The Lord our Righteouſneſs:* the ſum of which is, 'We are juſtified, ſanctified, and glori-'fied, for the ſake of what Chriſt has done and ſuf-'fered for us.' Nothing he aſſerts is inconſiſtent with this; though it may be inconſiſtent with *paſſages* left in the Chriſtian Library: when therefore I write *nothing* againſt thoſe paſſages, or the extracts from Goodwin, that contradict them, this does not prove, (as Mr. Hill archly ſays) that "I have no-"thing to ſay," but that all thoſe paſſages and extracts put together are nothing to the purpoſe. For were it true, that John Goodwin and Richard Baxter contradicted all thoſe paſſages, it is nothing to the point in hand: it never can prove, that I, John Weſley, contradict myſelf.

18. But to return to *the Everlaſting Covenant.* "Mr. W. himſelf, in his annotations on Gen. i. 1. "calls the *Elohim*, a *covenant God.*" True, in covenant with man. But I ſay not one word of any covenant between the Father and the Son. But "in his note on Iſai. lv. 4. ſpeaking of the cove-"venant made between God and David, he ſays, "*This David is Chriſt.*" Undoubtedly I do: but what is this brought to prove? My words are, '* I 'have appointed, and will in due time give *him*— 'the David laſt-mentioned, even Chriſt—*a witneſs* '—to declare the will of God concerning the duty 'and ſalvation of men, to bear witneſs to the truth, 'to confirm God's promiſes, and among others,

B 'thoſe

* Page 209.

'thoſe which reſpect the calling of the Gentiles: 'to be a witneſs to both parties of that covenant 'made *between God and man.*' Yea, of the covenant made *between God and man!* Of a covenant *between the Father and the Son* here is not a word.

"The only poſſible concluſion to be drawn from "this defence of Mr. W.'s, is, That he became a "commentator on the bible, before he could read "the bible." That is pity! If he could not read when he was three-ſcore years old, I doubt he never will. See the candor, the good-nature of Mr. Hill! Is this *attic* ſalt, or wormwood?

What concluſion can be poſſibly drawn in favour of Mr. Hill? The moſt favourable I can draw is this, That he never read the book which he quotes: that he took the word of ſome of his friends. But how ſhall we excuſe them? I hope they truſted their memories, not their eyes. But what recompence can he make to *me*, for publiſhing ſo groſs a falſhood; which nevertheleſs thoſe who read *his* tract, and not mine, will take to be as true as the goſpel?

II.

Of Election and Perſeverance.

19. In entering upon this head, I obſerved *, 'Mr. Sellon has clearly ſhewn, that the ſeven-'teenth article does not aſſert abſolute predeſtina-'tion. Therefore in denying this, I neither con-'tradict that article nor myſelf.'

It lies therefore upon Mr. Hill, to anſwer Mr. Sellon before he witticizes upon *me*. Let him do this, and he talks to the purpoſe: otherwiſe all the pretty, lively things he ſays about Dr. Baroe, Biſhop Wilkins, Dr. Clark, and George Bell, are utterly thrown away.

As

* Page 13.

As to George Bell, Mr. Richard ſays, Mr. M. "juſtly cenſures * the *enthuſiam* and *credulity* of "Mr. John, in paying ſo *much attention* to Bell's "ridiculous reveries; in calling him a *ſenſible* "man, and *entreating* him to continue in his ſo-"ciety, on account of the great good he did. How-"ever Bell *refuſed* to remain in connexion with "him, becauſe of his *double dealings* and *unfaith-"ful proceedings*: for he ſometimes was full of "Bell's praiſes; at other times he would warn the "people againſt him. He alſo gives a particular "narration of what he rightly calls the *Comet-En-"thuſiaſm*. Mr. John preached *more than ten times* "about the comet, which he *ſuppoſed* was to ap-"pear in 1758, to burn up all the produce of the "earth, and laſtly to execute its grand commiſſion "on the globe itſelf, cauſing the ſtars to fall from "heaven."

What an heap of dirt is here raked together? I muſt not let it paſs quite unnoticed. 1. He "juſt-"ly cenſures the *enthuſiaſm* and *credulity* of Mr. "W. in paying ſo *much attention* to Bell's ridicu-"lous reveries." Nay, ſo very little, that I check-ed them ſtrongly, as ſoon as ever they came to my knowledge: particularly his whim about the end of the world, which I earneſtly oppoſed both in private and public. 2. "Bragging of the *many mi-"raculous* cures he had wrought." I *bragged of*, that is, ſimply related the caſe of Mary Special, and no other: in the cloſe of which I ſaid, 'Here 'are three plain facts, ſhe was ill; ſhe is well; 'ſhe became ſo in a moment. Which of theſe 'can, with any modeſty, be denied?' I ſtill aſk the ſame queſtion. 3. That I ever called him a *ſenſible* man, is altogether falſe. A man of faith and love I then *knew* him to be; but I never thought him a man of ſenſe. 4. That I *entreated*

* Page 37.

him to continue in the ſociety, is likewiſe totally falſe: 5. Nor did I ever tell *him*, on that or any other occaſion, of "the great good" he did. I know, he was an inſtrument in God's hand, of convincing and converting many ſinners. But though I ſpeak this now to all the world, I never ſpoke it to himſelf. 6. Neither did he ever *refuſe* what never was aſked, "to remain in connexion "with me." 7. Leaſt of all did he refuſe it becauſe of my *double dealings* or *unfaithful proceedings*. He never mentioned to me any ſuch thing, nor had he any pretence ſo to do. 8. Nay, but you "was at ſome times full of Bell's praiſes"—Very moderately full:—"At other times"—that is, after he ran mad—"you warned the people againſt "him." I warned them not to regard his prophecies; particularly with regard to the ‡ 28th of February.

20. "He alſo gives us a particular narration of "what he rightly enough calls the *Comet-Enthuſiam*. "Mr. John preached *more than ten times about the* "*Comet* he ſuppoſed was to appear in 1758 and to "conſume the globe." This is a fooliſh ſlander, as it is ſo eaſily confuted. A tract was publiſhed at that very time, intitled, "Serious thoughts occaſioned by the earthquake at Liſbon." The thing which I then accidentally mentioned in preaching, (twice or thrice, it may be, four times) is there ſet down at large, much more at large than ever I mentioned it in any Sermon. The words are theſe.*

"Dr. Halley fixes the return of the Comet, "which appeared in 1682, in the year 1758." (Obſerve Dr. Halley does this, not I.) On which he adds, "But may the great, good God avert "ſuch a ſhock or contact of ſuch great bodies, "moving with ſuch forces, (which however is by "no

‡ Journal X. Page 99. * Page 14, & ſeq.

" no means impoſſible) leſt this moſt beautiful " order of things be entirely deſtroyed, and re- " duced into its ancient chaos."

' But what if God ſhould not avert this contact? ' what would the conſequence be?'——That conſequence I afterwards deſcribe.—' Burning up all ' the produce of the earth, and then the globe ' itſelf.' But do I affirm or *ſuppoſe*, that it *actually will* do this? I ſuppoſe, nay affirm, at the bottom of the ſame page, the direct contrary. ' What ' ſecurity is there againſt all this, on the *infidel* hy- ' potheſis? But on the Chriſtian there is *abundant* ' *ſecurity*: for the prophecies are not yet fulfilled.'

21. So much for the *Comet-Enthuſiaſm*. We return now to the point of *unconditional election*. " One would † imagine," ſays Mr. Hill, " by Mr. " W.'s quoting the thirty firſt article, in *contra-* " *diction* to the ſeventeenth, that he thought the " reformers as inconſiſtent as himſelf." I did not quote the 31ſt in *contradiction* to the 17th, but in *explication* of it. The latter, the thirty-firſt can bear but one meaning: therefore it fixes the ſenſe of the former. " Nay, this article ſpeaks nothing " of the *extent* of Chriſt's death, but of its *all-ſuffi-* " *ciency*."‡ Nothing of the extent! Why, it ſpeaks of nothing elſe: its all-ſufficiency is out of the queſtion. The words are, " The offering of Chriſt " once made, is that perfect redemption, propitia- " tion and ſatisfaction, for all the ſins of the whole " world, both original and actual." It is here affirmed, the death of Chriſt is a perfect ſatisfaction for *all the ſins of the whole world*. It *would be* ſufficient for a thouſand worlds. But of this the article ſays nothing.

But " even Biſhop Burnet allows our reformers " to have been zealous Calviniſts." He does not allow them *all* to be ſuch: He knew and you know

† Page 54. ‡ Page 55.

the contrary. You cannot but know, that Biſhop Ridley, Hooper, and Latimer, to name no more, were firm Univerſaliſts.

22. But the contradictions! Where are the contradictions? "Why, ſometimes you deny elec-"tion: yet another time you ſay,

"From all eternity with love
"Unchangeable thou haſt me view'd*."

I anſwered, 'I believe this is true, on the ſuppo-'ſition of *faith foreſeen*, not otherwiſe.'

Here is therefore no contradiction, unleſs on that ſuppoſition, which I do not allow.

But ſometimes "you deny the perſeverance of "the ſaints." Yet in one place you ſay, 'I do not 'deny, that thoſe eminently ſtiled the *elect ſhall* 'perſevere.' I mean thoſe that are *perfected in love*. So I was inclined to think for many years. But for ten or twelve years I have been fully convinced, that even theſe may *make ſhipwreck of the faith*.

23. But "ſeveral of Mr. Hill's quotations are "from Mr. Charles Weſley's hymns, for which "Mr. John ſays, he will not be anſwerable."

I will now explain myſelf upon this head. Though there are ſome expreſſions in my brother's hymns, which I do not uſe, as being very liable to be miſconſtrued: yet I am fully ſatisfied, that in the whole tenor of them, they thoroughly agree with mine, and with the bible: 2. That there is no jot of Calviniſm therein; that not one hymn, not one verſe of an hymn, maintains either unconditional election, or infallible perſeverance. Therefore I can readily anſwer Mr. H.'s queſtion, "How can Mr. W. anſwer it to his own conſci-"ence, to write prefaces and recommendations to "hymns

* Page 21.

" hymns which he does not believe?" There is the miſtake. I do believe them: although ſtill I will not be anſwerable for *every expreſſion* which may occur therein. But as to thoſe expreſſions which you quote, in proof of final perſeverance, they prove thus much, and no more, that the perſons who uſe them have at that time *the full aſſurance of hope*. Hitherto then Mr. Hill has brought no proof, that I contradict myſelf.

III.

Of Imputed Righteouſneſs. *

24. " Bleſſed be God, we are not among thoſe " who are ſo *dark* in their conceptions and ex- " preſſions. We no more deny (ſays Mr. W.) the " *phraſe* of *imputed righteouſneſs*, than *the thing*." It is true: for I continually affirm, To them that believe, *faith is imputed for righteouſneſs*. And I do not contradict this, in ſtill denying that *phraſe*, the *imputed righteouſneſs of Chriſt*, to be in the bible; or in beſeeching both Mr. Hervey and you, ' Not to ' diſpute for *that particular phraſe*.'

But " ſince Mr. W. bleſſes God for inlighten- " ing him to receive the doctrine, and to adopt the " phraſe of imputed righteouſneſs; how came he " to think that *clear conceptions* of the doctrine were " ſo unneceſſary, and the phraſe itſelf ſo uſeleſs, " after having ſo *deeply lamented* the *dark conceptions* " of thoſe who rejected the term and the thing?"

It was neither this *term*, *The imputed righteouſneſs of Chriſt*, nor the *thing* which Antinomians mean thereby, the rejection of which I ſuppoſed to argue any *darkneſs of conception*. But thoſe I think *dark* in their conceptions, who reject even the

* Page 23.

the *ſcripture-phraſe*, *Faith imputed for Righteouſneſs*, or the *thing* it means.

25. However, to prove his point, Mr. Hill goes on:

"This doctrine (of "the imputed righteouſ- "neſs of Chriſt) I have "conſtantly believed and "taught for near eight "and twenty years."	The uſe of the term (the imputed righteouſneſs of Chriſt) is not ſcriptural, it is not neceſſary; it has done immenſe hurt.

"It has done immenſe hurt, ſays Mr. W. but "here is no contradiction. Whether there be or "not, there is a plain conceſſion from Mr. W. "himſelf, that he has been *preaching a doctrine for "eight and twenty years together, which has done im-"menſe hurt.*"

Let this (one inſtance out of an hundred) be a ſpecimen of Mr. Hill's fairneſs! The whole ſtrength of the argument depends on the artful jumbling of two ſentences together, and inſerting two or three little words into the latter of them.

My words are, '‖ We no more deny the *phraſe* "(of imputed righteouſneſs) than the thing.'

'§ *This doctrine* I have believed and taught for "near eight and twenty years.'

Theſe diſtinct ſentences Mr. Hill is pleaſed to thruſt together into one, and to mend thus:

"This doctrine (of *the* imputed righteouſneſs *of "Chriſt*) I have conſtantly believed and taught "for near eight and twenty years."

And here, ſays Mr. H. is a "plain conceſſion "from Mr. W. himſelf, that he has been preach-"ing a doctrine for 28 years together, which has "done immenſe hurt."

No, the doctrine which I believe has done immenſe hurt, is that of the imputed righteouſneſs of Chriſt in the Antinomian ſenſe. The doctrine which

‖ Remarks, Page 14. § Page 15.

which I have conſtantly held and preached is, that faith is imputed for righteouſneſs.

And when I have either in that ſermon or elſewhere ſaid, that *the righteouſneſs of Chriſt is imputed to every believer*, I mean, every believer is juſtified, for the ſake of what Chriſt has done and ſuffered. Yet ſtill I think, "There is no uſe in contending "for *that particular phraſe*." And I ſay ſtill, 'I 'dare not inſiſt upon it, becauſe I cannot find it in 'the bible.'

To contradict this, Mr. H. cites theſe words, 'This is fully conſiſtent with our being juſtified, 'through the imputation of Chriſt's righteouſneſs.' Mr. W.'s notes on *Rom.* iv. 9. He adds, "Theſe "* two taken together, produce the following "concluſion, that it is *perfectly conſiſtent* to ſay, that "we are juſtified by that, *which cannot be found in "the bible*."

That note runs thus: '*Faith was imputed to Abra-'ham for righteouſneſs*. This is fully conſiſtent 'with our being juſtified through the imputation of 'the righteouſneſs of Chriſt; that is, our being 'pardoned and accepted of God, for the ſake of 'what Chriſt has done and ſuffered. For though 'this, and this alone, be the *meritorious cauſe* of 'our acceptance with God, yet *faith* may be ſaid 'to be *imputed to us for righteouſneſs*, as it is the ſole 'condition of our acceptance.'

Now is there any ſhadow of contradiction in this? Or of our being juſtified *by that which cannot be found in the bible?*

26. "Mr. W. frequently puts the expreſſion, "*imputed righteouſneſs*, in the mouth of a whole "congregation." Yet he ſays, 'I dare not *require* 'any to uſe it.' Hence Mr. Hill deduces theſe two concluſions:

1. "That

* Page 24.

1. "That Mr. W. gives out ſuch doctrines, *as* "*he dares not require any others to believe.*" †

By what logic is this deduced? We are not ſpeaking of *doctrines* at all, but ſimply of a particular *expreſſion*. And that expreſſion is not, *imputed righteouſneſs*; but *the imputed righteouſneſs of Chriſt*.

2. "That a whole congregation may have words "in their mouths, and yet be *all ſilent*."

Well inferred again! But did I ſay, "A whole "congregation had *thoſe words* in their mouths?" I did not either ſay or ſuppoſe it: any more than that they were *all ſilent*.

"Will Mr. W. be ingenuous enough to tell me, "Whether he did not write this, when he was "laſt in a certain country, which abounds with "*craſſa ingenia?*" I will. I did not write this in the fogs of Ireland, but in the clear air of Yorkſhire.

27. The two next propoſitions Mr. Hill quotes, are, 'They to whom the righteouſneſs of Chriſt is 'imputed,' (I mean, who truly believe) 'are made 'righteous by the Spirit of Chriſt, are renewed in 'the image of God, in righteouſneſs and true holi-'neſs.'

'The nice, metaphyſical doctrine of imputed 'righteouſneſs,' (if it is not carefully guarded) 'leads not to repentance, but to licentiouſneſs. I 'have known a thouſand inſtances of this.'

And where is the contradiction between theſe propoſitions? "It is juſt this *," ſays Mr. Hill, "That the doctrine of imputed righteouſneſs makes "thoſe who believe it both holy and unholy."

Unfold the propoſitions a little more, and then let any man judge.

The firſt means juſt this, They whom God juſtifies, for the ſake of what Chriſt has done and ſuffered, (whether they ever heard of that phraſe, imputing

† Page 25. * Page 26.

imputing the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, or not) are ſanctified by his Spirit; are renewed in the image of God, in righteouſneſs and true holineſs.

The ſecond means, I have known very many, who ſo reſted in the doctrine of the righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed to them, that they were quite ſatisfied without any holineſs at all.

Now where is the contradiction?

But my inſerting in my own ſentence thoſe explanatory words, 'I mean, who truly believe,' Mr. H. calls an *interpolation*, and ſuppoſes I "mean "to make a diſtinction between faith in Chriſt, "and faith in the righteouſneſs of Chriſt." I mean juſt what I have ſaid again and again, particularly in the note above-cited. And this is the very thing which John Goodwin means, as he declares over and over.

Mr. W. "winds up this point of *imputed righte-* "*ouſneſs* with a reſolution which aſtoniſhes me, "That 'he will never more uſe the phraſe, *the* "*imputed righteouſneſs of Chriſt*, unleſs it occur to "him in a hymn, or ſteal upon him unawares." This is my reſolution. I repeat once more what I ſaid in the Remarks, 'The *thing*, that we are juſ-'tified merely for the ſake of what Chriſt has *done* 'and *ſuffered*, I have conſtantly and earneſtly main-'tained above four and thirty years. And I have 'frequently uſed the *phraſe*, hoping thereby to '*pleaſe* others *for their good, to edification.* But it 'has had a contrary effect, ſince ſo many improve 'it into an objection. Therefore I will uſe it no 'more, (I mean, the phraſe *imputed righteouſneſs:* 'That phraſe, *the imputed righteouſneſs of Chriſt*, I 'never did uſe.) I will endeavour to uſe only 'ſuch phraſes as are *ſtrictly ſcriptural.*' And I will 'adviſe all my brethren, all who are in connexion 'with me throughout the three kingdoms, to lay 'aſide that ambigious, unſcriptural phraſe, (*the*

'*imputed*

'*imputed righteouſneſs of Chriſt*) which is ſo liable to 'be miſinterpreted, and ſpeak in all inſtances, this 'in particular, *as the oracles of God.*'

IV.

Of a Two-fold Juſtification.†

My words cited as contradicting this, run thus.

28. 'In the afternoon I was informed, how 'many wiſe and learned men, who cannot in terms 'deny it, (becauſe our articles and homilies are not 'yet repealed) *explain* juſtification by faith:‡ 'They ſay juſtification is two-fold, the firſt 'in this life, the ſecond at the laſt day, &c.—— 'In oppoſition to this, I maintain, That *the juſ-'tification ſpoken of by St. Paul to the Romans, and 'in our articles*, is not two-fold: it is one and no 'more.' True. And where do I contradict this? Where do I ſay, *the juſtification ſpoken of by St. Paul to the Romans, and in our articles*, is any more than one? The queſtion between them and me concerned *this* juſtification, and *this* only, which I affirmed to be but one. They averred, But there is a ſecond juſtification at the laſt day: therefore juſtification is not one only. Without entering into that queſtion, I replied, '*The juſtification whereof 'St. Paul, and our articles ſpeak*, is one only.' And ſo I ſay ſtill. And yet I do not deny, that there is another juſtification (of which our Lord ſpeaks) at the laſt day.

I do not therefore condemn the diſtinction of a two-fold juſtification, in ſaying, that *ſpoken of in our articles* is but one. And this is the thing which I affirmed, "in flat oppoſition to thoſe men."

29. But "how is it poſſible to encounter ſuch "a man as this, without watching him through "every

† Page 37. ‡ Page 38.

" every line? And therefore I wiſh my readers " would cloſely compare the Remarks with the " Review itſelf:" (I deſire no more. Whoever does this, will eaſily diſcern on which ſide the truth lies:) " As it is impracticable to point out " half the *little arts* of this kind which Mr. W. " has ſtooped to." That is, in civil terms, " Sir, " you are a knave." Sir, I crave your mercy. I ſtoop to no art, but that of plain, ſound reaſoning. By this art, and by this alone, I am able to untwiſt truth from falſhood, how ſkilfully ſoever they are woven together. I dare uſe no other; for (whether you know it or no) I fear God. And by his grace, in ſimplicity and godly ſincerity I have my converſation in the world.

" But how agrees this, with what Mr. W. " tells us, that he has never contradicted himſelf " with regard to juſtification, ſince the year " 1738?"* Perfectly well. " How long has " he held, that juſtification is *fourfold*?" I have ſaid nothing about it yet. " And how will he " reconcile this with its being two-fold, and with " his preceeding affirmation, that it is *one and no* " *more*?" When time is, this myſtery too may be cleared up.

V.

Of a Juſtified State. ‖

30. Mr. W. ſays, " The *ſtate* of a *juſtified* per- " ſon is inexpreſſibly great and glorious."

Yet he aſks elſewhere, " Does not talking of a " juſtified or ſanctified ſtate, tend to miſlead men?" He anſwers, ' It *frequently* does miſlead men,' (namely, when it is ſpoken of in an *unguarded manner*) ' But where is the contradiction?' " What-

* Page 39. ‖ Page 34.

" ever may be the contradiction, this is clearly the " conclusion, That Mr. W. by his own confession, " *is a misleader of men.*"

It is not quite clear yet. You have first to prove, that I use the phrase ' in an *unguarded manner.*' I confess, when it is so used, it tends to mislead men: but I do not confess, that I use it so.

VI.

Are Works a Condition of Justification?

31. " Mr. W. says, ' No *good works* can be pre- " vious to justification.' And yet in the same page " he asserts, ' Whoever desire to find favour with " God, should cease from evil, and learn to do " well."

I answered, § ' Does not the bible say so? Who ' can deny it? Nay, but Mr. W. asks, If this be ' not in order to find favour, what does he do ' them for? And I ask it again. Let Mr. Hill, or ' any one else, give me an answer. So if there is ' any contradiction here, it is not I contradict ' myself, but Isaiah and our Lord that contradict ' St. Paul.'

Mr. Hill replies, " Then a man may do works " in order to find favour, and yet such works can- " not be called *good.*" You may call them so, if you please: but be not angry with *me*, if I do not. I still believe, no *good works* can be done before justification. Yet I believe, (and that without the least self-contradiction) that final salvation is ' by ' works as a condition.' And let any one read over the twenty-fifth chapter of St. Matthew, and deny it if he can.

VII. Is

§ Remarks, Page 22.

VII.

Is Juſtification by Faith *Articulus ſtantis vel cadentis Eccleſiæ?* ‡

32. In the beginning of the year 1738, I believed it was ſo. Soon after I found reaſon to doubt. Since that time I have not varied. "Nay, but in "the year 1763 you ſay, 'This is the name where-"by he ſhall be called, *The Lord our Righteouſneſs*. "A truth this, of which may be affirmed, (what "Luther affirms of a truth nearly connected with "it, juſtification by faith) it is *Articulus ſtantis vel "cadentis eccleſiæ*. It is certainly the pillar and "ground of that faith of which alone cometh ſal-"vation."

I anſwered, † 'It is certain, here is a *ſeeming* con-'tradiction; but it is not a *real* one: for theſe two 'oppoſite propoſitions do not ſpeak of the *ſame 'thing*. The latter ſpeaks of *juſtification by faith*: 'the former, of *truſting in the righteouſneſs* or merits '*of Chriſt*. (Juſtification by faith is only mention-'ed incidentally in a parentheſis.) Now although 'Mr. Law denied *juſtification by faith*, he might '*truſt in the merits of Chriſt*. It is this, and this 'only that I affirm (whatever Luther does) to be '*Articulus ſtantis vel cadentis eccleſiæ*.'

But Mr. Hill thinks "Juſtification by faith, and "by truſting in the merits of Chriſt, are all one." * Be they or not, I ſtill think, 'Some may doubt of 'juſtification by faith, and yet not periſh everlaſt-'ingly.' Does Mr. Hill judge, that ſuch an one cannot be ſaved? That all Myſtics (as well as Mr. Law) go to hell?

VIII.

Both Adam's Sin and Chriſt's Righteouſneſs are imputed.

They are: the queſtion is only, In what ſenſe?

‡ Page 15. † Remarks, Page 24. * Page 16.

IX.

Of MERIT.†

33. In the Minutes I ſay, 'We are rewarded 'according to our works, yea, *becauſe of* our works, '(Gen. xxii. 16, 17.) How differs this from *for* 'the ſake of our works? And how differs this from 'ſecundum merita operum, or as our works deſerve? 'Can you ſplit this hair? I doubt I cannot.' I ſay ſo ſtill. Let Mr. Hill, if he can.

'And yet I ſtill maintain,' (ſo I added in the Remarks: ſo I firmly believe) 'there is no *merit*, 'taking the word ſtrictly, but in the blood of 'Chriſt: That ſalvation is not by the *merit* of 'works: And that there is nothing we are, or 'have, or do, which can, ſtrictly ſpeaking, *deſerve* 'the leaſt thing at God's hand.'

'And all this is no more than to ſay, Take the 'the word *merit* in a *ſtrict* ſenſe, and I utterly re-'nounce it: take it in a *looſer* ſenſe, and though I 'never uſe it, (I mean, I never aſcribe it to any 'man) yet I do not condemn it. Therefore with 'regard to the word *merit*, I do not contradict my-'ſelf at all.'

"You never uſe the word!" ſays Mr. Hill. "What have we then been diſputing about?" ‡ Why, about a ſtraw: namely, Whether there be a ſenſe in which *others* may uſe that word without blame.

But can Mr. Hill, or any one living, ſuppoſe me to mean, I do not uſe the word in the preſent queſtion?

What Mr. Hill adds, is a mere play upon words. "Does Mr. W. by this *looſer merit*, mean a merit "that does not *merit?*" Yes. By terming a work *meritorious* in this *improper* ſenſe, I do not mean, that

† Page 35. ‡ Page 36.

that it *merits* or *deſerves* a reward in the *proper* ſenſe of the word. Inſtances of the word taken in this *improper* ſenſe, occur all over the bible.

"This is ſhamefully evaſive." No more than it is Greek. It is a plain, rational, ſolid diſtinction: and it holds with regard to numberleſs words in all languages, which may be taken either in a *proper* or *improper* ſenſe.

When I ſay, 'I do not grant, that works are 'meritorious, even when accompanied by faith,' I take that word in a *proper* ſenſe. But others take it in an *improper*, as nearly equivalent with *rewardable*. Here therefore I no more contradict Mr. Fletcher, than I do myſelf. Leaſt of all do I plead, as Mr. Hill roundly affirms, "for juſtifica-"tion by the *merit* of my own good works." §

X.

Of MARRIAGE.*

34. "Mr. W. ſays, his thoughts on a ſingle life "are juſt the ſame, they have been theſe thirty "years." (I mean with regard to the advantages which attend that ſtate in general.) "Why then "did he marry?" I anſwered ſhort, 'For reaſons 'beſt known to himſelf.' As much as to ſay, I judge it extremely impertinent, for any but a ſuperior to aſk me the queſtion. So the harmleſs raillery which Mr. Hill pleaſes himſelf with upon the occaſion, may ſtand juſt as it is.

XI.

Concerning DRESS. †

35. "Mr. W. adviſes his followers to wear *no-"thing of a glaring colour*, nothing *made in the heighth*

§ Page 52. * Page 39. † Page 40.

" *of the faſhion*, in order to *increaſe their reward*, and " *brighten their crown in heaven.*"

" Nevertheleſs in his letter to a Quaker, he " ſays, ' To make it a point of conſcience, to dif- " fer from others, as to the ſhape and colour of " their apparel, is mere *ſuperſtition.*"

" Yet he ſays, ' So I adviſe: but I do not " make it a *point of conſcience.*' It follows, that we " are to increaſe our reward, and brighten our " crown in heaven, by doing that which is mere " *ſuperſtition*, and without acting from a *point of* " *conſcience.*"

I ſhall ſay more on this head than I otherwiſe would, in order to ſhew every impartial reader, by one inſtance in a thouſand, the manner wherein Mr. H. continually diſtorts and murders my words.

In my advice to the people called Methodiſts,‡ I ſay, ' I would not adviſe you to imitate the peo- ' ple called Quakers, in thoſe particularities of ' dreſs, which can anſwer no end, but to diſtin- ' guiſh you from all other people. But I adviſe ' you to imitate them in plainneſs: 1. Let your ' apparel be cheap, not expenſive; 2. Let it be ' grave, not gay or ſhowy; not in the point of the ' faſhion.'

' Would you have a farther rule? Then take ' one you may always carry in your boſom. *Do* ' *every thing with a ſingle eye*, and this will direct ' you in every circumſtance. Let a ſingle inten- ' tion to pleaſe God preſcribe, both what cloath- ' ing you ſhall buy, and the manner wherein it ' ſhall be made, and how you ſhall put on and ' wear it. In other words, Let all you do in this ' reſpect, be ſo done, that you may offer it to God, ' a ſacrifice acceptable through Jeſus Chriſt: ſo

' that

‡ Sermons, Vol. IV. Page 148 & ſeq. Firſt Edit.

'that conſequently it *may increaſe your reward*, and 'brighten your crown in heaven.'

Now is there any thing ridiculous in all this? I would appeal even to a rational deiſt, whether it be not, upon the Chriſtian ſcheme, all agreeable to the higheſt reaſon?

36. "But it is inconſiſtent with what you ſaid "elſe-where,' 'To make it a point of conſcience, "to differ from others, as the Quakers do, in the "ſhape or colour of their apparel, is mere ſuperſti-"tion."

Not inconſiſtent at all. It is mere ſuperſtition to make wearing a broad brimmed hat, or a coat with four buttons, (the very thing I referred to in the preceding page) a point of conſcience, that is a thing neceſſary to ſalvation.

Why then, ſays Mr. Hill, "we are to increaſe "our reward, and brighten our crown in heaven, "by doing what is *mere ſuperſtition*, and without "acting from a *point of conſcience!*"

Was ever ſuch twiſting of words? Has he not great reaſon to cry out, "O rare *Logica Weſleienſis! Qui bene diſtinguit, bene docet!*" I bleſs God, I can diſtinguiſh reaſon from ſophiſtry; unkind, unjuſt, ungenteel ſophiſtry, uſed purely for this good end, to aſperſe, to blacken a fellow Chriſtian—becauſe he is not a Calviniſt!

No, Sir: What I call ſuperſtition, and no point of conſcience, is wearing a Quaker hat or coat; which is widely different from the plainneſs of dreſs that I recommended to the people called Methodiſts.

My *logic* therefore ſtands unimpeached, I wiſh your *candor* did ſo too.

I would engage to anſwer every objection of Mr. Hill's, as fairly and fully, as this. But I cannot ſpare ſo much time. I am called to other employment.

And

And I ſhould really think, Mr. Hill might ſpend his time better, than in throwing dirt at his quiet neighbours.

XII.

Of TEA. ‡

37. " Mr. W. publiſhed a tract againſt drinking " tea, and told the tea-drinkers, he would ſet them " an example in that piece of ſelf-denial."

' I did ſet them an example for twelve years. ' Then at the cloſe of a conſumption, by Dr. Fo- ' thergill's direction, I uſed it again.'

" Why then did Mr. W. re-publiſh this tract, " making the world believe it brought a paralytic " diſorder upon him?" Before I was twenty years old, it made my hand ſhake, ſo that I could hardly write. " Is it not ſtrange then, that Dr. " Fothergill ſhould adviſe Mr. W. to uſe what " had before thrown him into the *palſy?*" I did not ſay ſo: I never had the palſy yet: though my hand ſhook, which is a *paralytic diſorder.* But be it ſtrange or not, ſo Dr. F. adviſed: If you believe not *me*, you may enquire of himſelf. The low wit that follows, I do not meddle with: I leave it with the gentle reader.

XIII.

Of BAPTISM. *

38. Mr. W. ſays, ' As there is no clear proof ' for *dipping* in ſcripture, ſo there is very probable ' proof to the contrary.'

" Why then did you at Savannah baptize all " children by immerſion, *unleſs the parents* certified " they were weak?"

I an-

‡ Page 41. * Page 42.

I anſwered, ‘ Not becauſe I had any ſcruple, ‘ but in obedience to the rubric.’

Mr. Hill, according to cuſtom, repeats the objection, without taking the leaſt notice of the anſwer.

As to the ſtory of half drowning Mrs. L. S. let her aver it to my face, and I ſhall ſay more. Only obſerve, Mr. Toplady is not “ *my* friend.” He is all *your own*; your friend, ally and fellow-ſoldier:

Ut non
Compoſiti melius cum Bytho Bacchius!

You are in truth, *Duo fulmina belli.* It is not ſtrange, if their thunder ſhould quite drown the ſound of my “ poor pop-guns.”

39. “ But what ſurpaſſes every thing elſe is, “ that Mr. W. cannot even ſpeak of his contra- “ dictions, without contradicting himſelf afreſh. “ For he abſolutely denies,* not only that he ever “ was unſettled in his principles, but that he was “ ever accuſed of being ſo, *either by friends or foes.*” *Either by friends or foes!* I will not reſt the whole cauſe upon this. If this be true, I am out of my wits. If it be falſe, what is Mr. Hill? An honeſt, upright, ſenſible man; but a little too warm, and therefore not ſeeing ſo clearly in this as in other things.

My words are, ‘ My friends † have oftener ac- ‘ cuſed me of being too ſtiff in my opinions, than ‘ too flexible. My enemies have accuſed me of ‘ both, and of every thing beſides.’ Is this “ de- “ nying that ever I was accuſed of inconſiſtency “ *either by friends or foes?*”

I do ſtill deny, that Mr. Delamotte ‡ ſpoke to me, “ of my wavering, unſettled diſpoſition.” But he “ ſpoke to you, ſays Mr. Hill, *of ſomething elſe.*” ’Tis very likely he might.

40. Mr.

* Pages 38, 39. † Remarks, Page 39. ‡ Page 43.

40. Mr. W. is equally ſelf-inconſiſtent, " with " regard to the Myſtics. § Theſe he tells us he " had *once in great veneration*;" (I had two or three and forty years ago) as the *beſt explainers of the goſpel of Chriſt*, yet afterwards he declares he *looks upon them, as one great Antichriſt*. I did look upon them as ſuch thirty years ago. But in my Remarks I ſay, ' I retract this. It is far too ſtrong.' But obſerve, I never contradicted it till now.

But how does this agree with Mr. W.'s ſaying, " I never was in the way of Myſticiſm at all!"

Perfectly well: I admire the myſtic writers. But I never *was in their way*; leaving off the outward means.

" But why did Mr. W. let the expreſſion ſtand, " *Solomon is the chief of the myſtics?*" Perhaps becauſe I thought it an harmleſs one, and capable of a good meaning. But I obſerve again: Mr. H. takes it for granted, that I have the correction of Mr. Fletcher's books. This is a miſtake: of ſome I have; of others, I have not.

41. Now comes the capital inſtance of ſelf-inconſiſtency. " ‖ In 1770 Mr. W. eſteems the Mi- " nutes the ſtandard of orthodoxy. In 1771 he " ſigns a paper, owning them to be *unguarded*. In " 1772 he tells us, he does not know but it would " have been better, not to have ſigned that paper at " all!" Suppoſe all this true, what will it prove? Only, that I made a conceſſion which was made an ill uſe of.

But " Mr. F.'s defence makes poor Mr. W. ap- " pear more and more inconſiſtent. Mr. W. de- " clares the Minutes to be *unguarded*: (that is, *not " enough guarded* againſt cavillers:) Mr. F. defends " them, and ſtrives to reconcile them with the " Declaration. But then comes Mr. W. and tells " us, He does not know but it had been better not " to

§ Page 14. ‖ Page 13.

" to have ſigned it at all." And what then? Why " hereby he intimates, that he has fixed a " different ſenſe upon the Minutes from that which " they originally bore." No ſuch thing: He intimates this and no more, That by that well-intended conceſſion he had given occaſion to thoſe who ſought occaſion of offence againſt him.

So all this laboured charge vaniſhes into air, and no more proves inconſiſtency than high-treaſon.

42. We come now to the main point, *Perfection*; the objections to which ſpread almoſt throughout the book. But the queſtion is not, Whether the doctrine be true or falſe? But whether I contradict myſelf concerning it?

As to what occurs in the fourth and fifth pages, it may therefore ſuffice to ſay, I do believe (as you obſerve) that *real Chriſtians* (meaning thoſe that are *perfected in love*) are freed from *evil* or *ſinful thoughts*. And where do I contradict this?

P. 10. " You ſay, I cannot prove the facts alledg- " ed againſt ſome profeſſors of perfection. Indeed " I can." If you could, that would not prove that I contradict myſelf on this head.

" But one at Worc—r writes, ' I can ſend you " an account of two or three ſhocking inſtances of " bad behaviour among the profeſſors of perfection " here." Perhaps ſo. But will that prove *my* inconſiſtency?

43. A while ſince Mr. Ma——d related to me the whole ſtory of Samuel Wi——n. I know not that I ever heard of it before, but only ſome imperfect fragments of it. The other ſtory, of a " preacher of perfection, who ſaid, the Holy Ghoſt " viſibly deſcended on all true converts," may be true for ought I know: but I queſtion much, whether that madman was a preacher? It may likewiſe be true, that ſeveral wild expreſſions were uttered

at

at West-Street Chapel. Yet I think, all these put together will not prove that I contradict myself.

However, I am glad to read, "If I publish another edition of the *Review*, these instances shall all be omitted; and *personal vilifications* shall be left to the sole pen of Mr. W." Then you will reduce your *Farrago* to a page, and your *Review* to a penny pamphlet. But still *personal vilification* will not suit my pen. I have better employment for it.

44. You say, p. 26, "Let us now proceed to Mr. W.'s assertions on sinless perfection."

As I observed before, I am not now to dispute, Whether they are right or wrong? I keep therefore to that single point, Do I herein contradict myself, or not?

When I said, 'If some of our hymns contradict 'others,' I did not allow, they do. I meant only, if it were so, this would not prove that I contradict myself. "But still it proves, the people must sing "contradictions." Observe; that is, If——

In your account of perfection, blot out *No wandering thoughts*. None in the body are exempt from these. This we have declared over and over: particularly in the Sermon wrote upon that subject.

If in the Sermon on Eph. ii. 8. (not xi. 5. as your blunderer prints it) the words which I had struck out in the preceding edition, are inserted again, what will this prove? Only that the printer, in my absence, printed, not from the last, but from an uncorrected copy. However, you are hereby excused from unfairness, as to that quotation. But what excuse have you in the other instance, with regard to Enoch and Elijah? On which I asked, 'Why is Mr. Hill so careful to name the first edi-'tion? Because in the second the mistake is cor-'rected. Did he know this? And *could* he avail

'himself

'himſelf of a miſtake which he *knew* was removed 'before he wrote?' *

It is now plain he *could!* Nay, inſtead of owning his unfairneſs, he endeavours to turn the blame upon *me!* "You are as inconſiſtent in your cen"ſures as in your doctrines: You blame me for "quoting the *laſt* edition of your Sermon; whereas "you call me to account for quoting the *firſt* edi"tion of your Notes, concerning Enoch and Eli"jah: each of whom you have proved, by a pecu"liar rule of *Foundery-Logic*, to be both in heaven "and out of heaven." So without any remorſe, nay, being ſo totally unconcerned as even to break jeſts on the occaſion, you again 'avail yourſelf of 'a miſtake which you *knew* was removed before 'you wrote.'

45. But Mr. W. "hath both *ſtruck out* ſome "words, and *put in* others, into the Sermon."—This is a common complaint with Mr. Hill; on which therefore it is needful to explain.

I generally abridge what I anſwer; which cannot be done without *ſtriking out* all uneſſential words. And I generally *put in* to quotations from my own writings, ſuch words as I judge will prevent miſtakes.

Now to the contradictions.

'If we ſay we have no ſin *now remaining*, (I 'mean, after we are juſtified) we deceive our-'ſelves.'

I believe this: and yet I believe

'Sin ſhall not *always* in our fleſh *remain*.'

Again, 'Many *infirmities* do remain.'

This I believe: and I believe alſo

'He that is born of God, (and *keepeth himſelf*, '1 John v. 18.) *ſinneth not by infirmities*, whether 'in act, word, or thought.'

I believe likewiſe, that in thoſe perfected in love,

* Remarks, Page 29.

'No wrinkle of infirmity,
'No ſpot of ſin remains.'

My Brother, at the bottom of the page, expreſsly ſays, 'No *ſinful* infirmity.' So whether this be ſcriptural or not, here is no contradiction.

I have ſpoken ſo largely already concerning [illegible]ns of *ſurprize* and *infirmity*, that it is quite needleſs to add any more. I need only refer to the *Remarks*, at the thirty-fourth and following pages.

46. But to go on.

'I wreſtle not now.'

This is an expreſſion of my Brother's, which I do not ſubſcribe to.

'We wreſtle not with fleſh and blood.'

"This he allows to be his own." *

Indeed I do not: although it is true, 'the *perpe-*
'*tual war* which I ſpeak of in the note on Eph. vi.
'18. is *a war with principalities and powers, but not*
'*with fleſh and blood.*' "But either way Mr. John
"is ſtuck faſt in the mire. For in his *Remarks* he
"contradicts his Brother: in his *Annotations* he
"contradicts himſelf: and in his *Hymn* he contra-
"dicts both his Brother and himſelf."

Mr. John is not quite *ſtuck faſt* yet: for this is a miſtake from beginning to end. 1. I do not contradict my Brother in my *Remarks*. In ſaying, 'I
'do not ſubſcribe to that expreſſion,' I mean, I do not make it my own; I do not undertake to defend it. Yet neither do I enter the liſts againſt it: it is capable of a ſound meaning. 2. I do not contradict myſelf in the *Note*; let him prove it that can. 3. I contradict nobody in the *Hymn*; for it is not mine.

Again. 'I never ſaid, While one *evil thought*
'can riſe, I am not *born again*. My Brother ſaid
'ſo once: but he took the words in too high a
'ſenſe.' I add, and in a ſenſe not warranted by the bible. And yet I believe, that 'real *Chriſ-*
'*tians*,

* Page 31.

'*tians*, I mean those perfected in love, are freed 'from evil or *sinful thoughts*.'

"But is not a babe in Christ *born again?* Is he "not a *real Christian?*" He is doubtless born again; and in some sense he is a real Christian; but not in the sense above defined.

47. We come now to the additional contradictions which Mr. Hill undertakes to find in my writings. They are already dwindled into one: And I hope to shew quickly, this one is none at all.—— It stands thus.

'Most express are the words of St. John, *We* '*know, that whosoever is born of God, sinneth not*.'

'Indeed it is said, this means only, He doth not 'commit sin *wilfully* or *habitually*.'

(Observe. I do not deny the text to mean this: but I deny that it means *this only*.)

As a contradiction to this, Mr. Hill places these words in the opposite column.

'The apostle John declares, Whosoever is born 'of God sinneth not, 1. By any habitual sin; 'nor, 2. by any *wilful* sin.' True; but do I say, the apostle means *this only?* Otherwise here is no contradiction. So although you have got the gallows ready, you have not turned off *old Mordecai* yet. As you so frequently give me that appellation, I for once accept of your favour.

48. "Before I quit this subject" (of perfection) "I cannot help expressing my astonishment, that "Mr. W. should deny his tenets on that point, "which exactly harmonize with those of the popish "church: Since all the decrees and books that "have been published by the Roman clergy, prove "this matter beyond a doubt."

I believe, you have been told so. But you should not assert it, unless from personal knowledge. "Alexander Ross says so." What is Alexander Ross? See with your own eyes. "Mr.

"Hervey

" Hervey too gives an account of Lindenus and " Andradius." *Second-hand evidence* ſtill. Have you ſeen them yourſelf? Otherwiſe you ought not to allow their teſtimony. " As to that moſt " excellent and evangelical work," as you term it, the eleven letters aſcribed to Mr. Hervey, Mr. Sellon has abundantly ſhewn, that they are moſt excellently virulent, ſcurrilous and abuſive; and full as far from the evangelical ſpirit, as the Koran of Mahomet.

" But Biſhop Cowper"——I object to him, beſide his being a *hot*, *bitter* Calviniſt, that he is a dull, heavy, ſhallow writer. And let him be what he may, all you cite from him, is but ſecond-hand authority.——" Nay, I refer to the biſhop's own words." But ſtill you have only the words at ſecond-hand. In order to know the tenets of the church of Rome, you muſt read the Romiſh authors themſelves. Nay, it does not ſuffice to read their own private authors. They will diſown any thing we charge them with, unleſs we can prove it, by recurring to their public and authentic records. Such are the " *Canones & Decreta Concilii Tridentini.*" Such the " *Catechiſmes ad* " *Parochos.*" Till you have read theſe at leaſt, you ſhould never undertake to determine what is, or what is not popery.

49. " But as I am now on the ſubject of popery, " * I muſt make a few animadverſions on what " Mr. W. affirms, ' I always thought the tenets of " the church of Rome, were nearer by half to Mr. " Hill's tenets, than to Mr. W.'s." Nay, give the honour of this to its true author; Mr. Hill goes to conſult a Popiſh Friar at Paris, a Benedictine Monk, one Father Walſh, concerning the Minutes of the conference. Father Walſh (Mr. Hill ſays; and I ſee no reaſon to ſcruple his authority

* Page 33.

thority here;) assures him, that the Minutes contain false doctrines: And that the tenets of the church of Rome are nearer by half to his (Mr. Hill's) tenets than they are to Mr. W.'s. (So Mr. Hill himself informs the world, in the Paris conversation, of famous memory: Which I really think, he would never have published, unless as the vulgar say, the devil had owed him a shame.) I add 'Truly I always thought so.' But I am the more confirmed therein, by the authority of so competent a judge: Especially when his judgment is publicly delivered by so unexceptionable a witness.

50. Nay, but "you know the principles of the "Pope and of John Calvin are quite opposite to "each other." I do not know, that they are opposite at all in this point. Many Popes have been either Dominicans or Benedictines. And many of the Benedictines, with all the Dominicans, are as firm Predestinarians as Calvin himself. Whether the present Pope is a Dominican, I cannot tell: If he is, he is far nearer your tenets than mine.

Let us make the trial with regard to your ten propositions.

1. "You deny *election.*	So does the Pope of Rome." I know not that. Probably he holds it.
2. "You deny *perseverance.*	So does the Pope of Rome." That is much to be doubted.
3. "You deny *imputed righteousness.*	The Pope of Rome does: but I assert it connually.

4. "You hold *free-will.* So does the Pope of Rome." No, not as I do (unless he is a predestinarian: otherwise) he ascribes it to *nature*, I to *grace.*

5. "You

5. " You hold, that *works* are a condition of juſtification.

If you mean *good works*, I do not.

6. " You hold *a two-fold juſtification*, one now, another at the laſt day.

So does the Pope of Rome." And ſo do all Proteſtants, if they believe the bible.

7. " You hold the doctrine of *merit*.

I do not. Neither does the Pope, if Father Walſh ſays true.

8. " You hold *ſinleſs perfection*.

So does the Pope." I deny that. How do you prove it?

9. " You hold, that *ſins* are only *infirmities*.

I hold no ſuch thing. And *you* know it well.

10. " You diſtinguiſh between *venial* and *mortal* ſins."

Not ſo: I abhor the diſtinction.

Now let every man of underſtanding judge, Whether Father Walſh did not ſpeak the very truth?

51. " This pamphlet was finiſhed,* when I was " told, that Mr. W. had lately a very remarkable " dream, which awakened him out of a ſound " ſleep. This dream he communicated to his ſo- " ciety. It was in ſubſtance as follows. A big, " rough man came to him, and gave him a violent " blow upon the arm with a red-hot iron."

" Now the interpretation thereof I conceive to " as follows:

1. " The *big, rough man*, is Mr. Hill:

2. " The *bar of iron* (red-hot!) is *Logica Weſ-* " *leienſis:*

3. " The *blow* denotes *the ſhock* which Mr. John " will receive by the ſaid pamplet:

4. " His being *awakened out of a ſound ſleep*, ſig- " nifies there is yet hope, that he will ſome time or " other come to the right uſe of his ſpiritual facul- " ties."

Pretty

* Page 61.

Pretty and well deviſed! And though it is true, I never had any ſuch dream ſince I was born, yet I am obliged to the inventor of it; and that on many accounts.

I am obliged to him,

1. For ſending againſt me only a *big, rough man*: it might have been a lion, or a bear:

2. For directing the *bar of iron* only to my arm; it might have been my poor ſcull:

3. For letting the *big man* give me only *one blow*: had he repeated it, I had been ſlain outright: and

4. For hoping I ſhall, ſome time or other, come to the right uſe of my ſpiritual faculties.

52. Perhaps Mr. Hill may expect, that I ſhould make him ſome return for the favour of his heroic poem. But

"Certes I have, for many days
"Sent my poetic herd to graze."

And had I not, I ſhould have been utterly unable to preſent him with a parallel. Yet upon reflection, I believe I can, although, I own, it is rather of the lyric, than the heroic kind. And becauſe poſſibly he may be inclined to write notes on this too, I will tell him the origin of it. One Sunday, immediately after ſermon, my father's clerk ſaid, with an audible voice, "Let us ſing to the praiſe "and glory of God, An hymn of mine own com-"poſing." It was ſhort and ſweet, and ran thus:

"King William is come home, come home:
"King William home is come!
"Therefore let us together ſing
"The hymn that's call'd Te D'um!"

53. Before I conclude, I beg leave, in my turn, to give you a few advices.

And 1. *Be calm.* Do not venture into the field again, till you are maſter of your temper. You know, *the wrath of man worketh not the righteouſneſs*, neither promotes the truths, *of God.*

2. Be

3. Be *good natured*. Paſſion is not commendable; but *ill-nature* ſtill leſs. Even irrational anger is more excuſable than *bitterneſs*, leſs offenſive to God and man.

3. *Be courteous*. Shew good manners as well as good-nature, to your opponent of whatever kind. "But he is rude." You need not be ſo too. If you regard not him, "Reverence yourſelf."

Abſolutely contrary to this, is the crying out at every turn, "Quirk, ſophiſtry, evaſion!" In controverſy theſe exclamations go for nothing. This is neither better nor worſe than *calling names*.

4. *Be merciful*. When you have gained an advantage over your opponent, do not preſs it to the uttermoſt. Remember the honeſt Quaker's advice to his friend a few years ago. "Art thou not content to lay John Weſley upon his back, but thou "wilt tread his guts out?"

5. In writing do not conſider yourſelf as a *man of fortune*, or take any liberty with others on that account. Theſe diſtinctions weigh but little more in the literary world, than in the world of ſpirits. Men of ſenſe ſimply conſider, what is written: not whether the writer be a lord or a cobler?

Laſtly, Remember, *For every idle word men ſhall ſpeak, they ſhall give an account in the day of judgment.* Remember, *by thy words ſhalt* thou *be juſtified*; or *by thy words ſhalt* thou *be condemned!*

BRISTOL, *March* 14, 1773.

FINIS.